

Call to Order – 12:37 pm, August 20, 2014|MBC 2294

The Granting Committee acknowledged that the meeting was being conducted on the Unceded Coast Salish Territories of the Squamish, Musqueam, Stó:lo, and Tsleil-Waututh people.

**1. Roll Call of Attendance**

**Committee Composition**

Board Member (*chair*) ..... Shirin Escarcha  
Vice President Student Life (*MSO pro tem*)..... Kayode Fatoba  
Board of Directors Member ..... Ayla Kooner  
Councillor..... Clara Chow  
Student At-Large .....

**Society Staff**

General Office Coordinator ..... Rena Hood-Lundrie  
DSU Outreach Worker..... Katie Mai

**Guests**

Board of Directors Member ..... Moe Koaphi  
Board of Directors Member..... Deepak Sharma  
Board of Directors Member ..... Jeremy Pearce

**Regrets**

Councillor..... Ali Najaf  
Student At-Large ..... Rahul Rajanala

**2. Adoption of the Agenda**

MOTION GC 2014-08-20:01

Chow

*Be it resolved to adopt the agenda as amended.*

Added SFU Camping Club grant proposal.  
Added Science Frosh as a discussion item.

CARRIED

**3. Ratification of Regrets**

MOTION GC 2014-08-20:02

Chow

*Be it resolved to ratify regrets from:*

Councillor..... Ali Najaf  
Student At-Large ..... Rahul Rajanala

CARRIED

**4. Matters Arising from the Minutes**

MOTION GC 2014-08-20:03

Kooner

*Be it resolved to approve the minutes of 2014-08-13*

CARRIED

## 5. Updates

### a. Working Group Updates

**Loans Working Group:** The loans working group has recently been exploring the best way to issue loans to clubs. One option is to create categories and separate clubs into categories based on their mandate. From there, Granting Committee can determine whether a group should be granted funds based on the category they belong to, and if it doesn't align with granting policy, then the Society can look at loaning the money. Also recently exploring options in which clubs can pay back the loan. Also exploring the possibility of creating a collective bank account at Vancity, so that the SFSS can take up the responsibility of overseeing clubs' external bank accounts. In this way, we can monitor their spending.

**Resources Working Group:** The Resources Working Group has decided that it would be best to change the format from a spectrum into a quadrant. The quadrant will consist of four squares: hard costs, soft costs, mandatory, and optional. Still working on terminology: for example, would need to define the difference between mandatory hard cost and optional hard cost.

## 6. Granting Presentations

### a. SFU Camping Club Grant Reconsideration

The SFU Camping Club organizes large-scale camping trips in July. Applied for a loan in July to ensure that in case any extenuating circumstances arise that would affect the expected revenue, the organizers would have monetary backup. \$500 was granted at the time. Unfortunately, the weather unexpectedly changed and as a result, only 150 attended (200-300 attendees were originally expected). The tiers of ticket prices were free, then \$5, then \$10. As a result, many of the already reduced number of attendees came for free. For food, the club charged \$10/person for the entire weekend. However, some people still brought their own food. Furthermore, there were unexpected costs, including a charge from UHaul for extra mileage, and a charge for one of the rented tents as it broke due to the wind. Now, SFU Camping Club is returning to the Granting Committee requesting a reconsideration of the original grant to include another \$670 on top of the previously granted \$500 as at the moment, the funds were paid out of the organizers' pockets.

Question raised around what efforts are currently being made to re-cooperate costs. The SFU Camping Club returned anything that was unused and unopened, and that procedure saved \$250.

Question raised around why attendees did not opt into the food plan. Responded that the meals were accommodating for all eaters, and that it was possible that some people opted out because \$10 for a weekend's worth of meals seems suspicious.

Question raised around the association between Moe Kopahi (the presenter) and the SFU Camping Club. Responded that Moe does not have a position, but because none of the executives could attend the meeting today, Moe is speaking on their behalf.

Question raised around how the Camping Club would have dealt with the situation if hypothetically they were not granted the funds. Responded that efforts to fundraise will be made. For example, the tent that broke due to the wind was mended, and the organizers will

attempt to sell it. If successful, it could be sold for \$300. However, if they grant does not go through, the organizers will be paying out of pocket. Noted that all expenses were charged on one credit card, and the Visa bill is due August 25<sup>th</sup>, thus there is a sense of urgency. Furthermore, it was mentioned that originally the Camping Club had approached the Granting Committee requesting a loan of \$2,700, and the conditions for the loan were that in the event of unforeseen circumstances, actions will be made to accommodate the issue. The weather was an unforeseen circumstance.

General Office Coordinator mentioned that there is no precedent as grants have never been retroactively increased in the past.

*Kopahi left at 1:00 PM.*

## 7. Grant Considerations

### a. SFU Camping Club Grant Reconsideration

The SFU Camping Club faced a series of unfortunate events. It makes sense for them to come back to the Granting Committee. It was suggested that an increase is reasonable, perhaps not the full amount, but an increase should be considered.

Mentioned that the weather should not be considered an unforeseen circumstance for a camping trip, especially as it is taking place in the lower mainland, and the group could have approached the committee with a proposal with the expectation that it may rain that weekend.

Mentioned that the way the SFU Camping Club applied for grants has been procedurally incorrect (original proposal came to the committee table the Wednesday before the trip, and many execs were already departed for the site by then. Reconsideration proposal came to the committee table a month after the trip and the Wednesday before the credit card bill was due, and was added to the agenda through an amendment). Reiterated that this event speaks to the importance of timelines and expectations from student groups.

Mentioned that though it is not the individual's fault, Moe Kopahi speaks to the Granting Committee on a club executive level. Noted that SFSS policies should better reflect the boundaries between Board of Directors members and their involvement with SFSS clubs. **Action item:** Shirin Escarcha and Clara Chow to suggest amendments to R-6, R-7, and AP-12 to the CPR committee.

Suggested offering the \$670 in the form of a partial loan and a partial grant. Would not feel comfortable giving nothing as the SFSS does not want to discourage the club from continuing this event in future years.

Mentioned that some of the expenses were wants rather than needs, for example, the DJ set cost \$800.

Mentioned that the food was purchased at cost. Perhaps the club could have had it donated from Costco rather than purchasing all the food at cost.

Approving a loan would keep the club active for the year because they will be doing fundraisers.

One point to consider is that the Granting Committee already approved \$500, so critiquing factors during the reconsideration – such as the lack of Costco sponsorship and the high costs of certain purchases – it is the Granting Committee’s responsibility for not having done its due diligence in asking the right questions the first time. Upon approving the grant of \$500, the committee implicitly endorses the practices that we currently don’t agree with. Ultimately, the committee should act on the fact that it previously endorsed this project fully knowing the possible repercussions. In this case, it was suggested that the committee make an exception in not critiquing those factors, but learn for the future.

Responded that that is a reasonable point, but the committee should also consider that it was put in a position to make a rush decision, and not enough time to properly review and make a judgment call, because the proposal came to the table so late. Thus, the group should also be held responsible.

Returned to the conversation regarding the importance of expectations and deadlines. For example, agendas should not be amended to incorporate motions, only discussion items.

It was noted that due to incorrect procedures in the application process, the Granting Committee will be outlining the expectations in a memorandum of understanding so mistakes are not repeated in the future.

Discussed the wording of the motion. Motion would read:

*“Whereas* reconsideration of the original grant of \$500 for the SFU Camping Club Ultimate Camping Trip 2014 is being determined

*Whereas* there will be 4 signing officers in a memorandum of understanding: 2 from the SFU Camping Club – 1 signing officer who was involved with the organizing of the 2014 Ultimate Camping Trip and is re-registering as an executive for the 2014/2015 year, 1 signing officer who is a general executive member of the SFU Camping Club; 2 from the SFSS Granting Committee – 1 General Office Coordinator, 1 member.

*Whereas* this circumstance is an absolute exception and is unprecedented

*Be it resolved to* loan the SFU Camping Club \$670 from the Club Granting Line Item as a loan to be fully repaid by Dec 31, 2014.”

It was suggested to table the motion because the club had known that the individual’s Visa bill was due Aug 25<sup>th</sup>, yet they did not approach the committee until Aug 20<sup>th</sup>, and had to request an amendment to the agenda in order to be on it. This puts the committee in a tenuous position and pushes it to rush through a procedure due to pressure. By tabling, the committee can solidify the policy surrounding loans before coming to a decision.

Noted that the procedure to issue a cheque will take longer than 5 days, so the Camping Club would not be able to pay back the Visa by Aug 25<sup>th</sup> regardless of if the funds were approved today or not. In light of this, tabling the motion would result in a late payment anyway.

Committee decided to postpone the above motion until the Sept 3, 2014 Granting Committee meeting. Opposition noted from VP Student Life.

## **8. Discussions**

### **a. AP-12 Clubs Draft Policy**

The draft will be circulated through email. It will be put on the Sept 3<sup>rd</sup> Granting Committee agenda and be reviewed then.

### **b. Science Frosh**

Science Frosh is being planned by Sci Crew – a registered club – and the Science DSUs. Question raised around whether this should be presented as a separate or consolidated grant. Responded that a consolidated grant should come to the table.

Noted that the DSUs have not moved money motions in support of the grant proposal yet, so that will be finalized before Sept 3. The Science Representative was advised to make sure to outline how much each group is contributing. Also advised to bring Sci Crew members to the meeting as BOD members should be less involved with club and DSU projects.

## **9. Announcements**

### **a. Granting Committee Fall 2014 Expectations**

Document outlining Fall 2014 expectations of clubs and DSUs will be distributed; bringing it to the committee for review beforehand.

The document includes external and internal expectations.

A memorandum of understanding will also be going out to clubs and DSUs. The MOU states that meetings will take place 10 AM – 11:30 AM, September 3<sup>rd</sup> will be the first meeting and December 3<sup>rd</sup> will be the last. There will be no meetings at the end of each month. Student groups can refer to the SFSS meeting calendar. Proposals must be sent in the Thursday prior to the meeting, and will receive a response from the committee as to whether they will be attending on the Monday prior to the meeting at the latest. Clubs must submit their proposal 4 weeks before the event. The timeline for DSUs is still being decided. Groups will have 5 minutes to present and 2 minutes for Q&A. This means the committee can grant up to 36 proposals the entire year. This number was decided based on the usual amount of grants received.

General Office Coordinator suggested adding a clause stating that a minimum of 14 days is required in order for a proposal to be considered. If the proposal is submitted under 14 days, then the requested amount must be reduced to under \$500 for clubs and under \$1000 for DSUs.

## **10. Attachments**

SFU CAMPING CLUB ULTIMATE CAMPING TRIP 2014 GRANT PROPOSAL.docx

**11. Adjournment 1:53pm**

---

KM | CUPE 3338